

Appl. No. 09/001,643  
Amdt. dated June 27, 2005  
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure  
Examining Group 2178

PATENT

**Amendment(s) to the Drawings:**

The attached 2 sheets of drawings include Figures 1-4 and replace the original sheets including Figures 1-4. No substantive changes have been made to the Figures.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (2 sheets)

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-12 were pending in this application. No claims have been amended, added or canceled. Hence, claims 1-12 remain pending. Reconsideration of the subject application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,710,900 to Anand et al. ("Anand") in view of US Patent No. 6,058,170 to Jagadish et al. ("Jagadish").

Claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anand in view of Jagadish and further in view of US Patent No. 5,930,764 to Melchione et al. ("Melchione").

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of all claims since the cited references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Specifically, the cited references do not teach "a data manager arranged to relate data maintained independently from the host site on a user computer terminal with the user's billing and inventory data for display as part of a requested report, wherein at least a portion of the data maintained independently from the host computer site is displayed as part of the requested report" as recited by claim 1. The office action provides a confusing line of reasoning that seems to depend on the "summary parameters" of Jagadish being included in the "summary information." This is clearly not the case. One skilled in the art will readily understand that the summary parameters and summary information are related as "data categories" and "data." The data may be comprised by – even defined by – the data categories. Data categories however, cannot be said to be included in the data, which is directly analogous to the situation here: the summary information described by Jagadish cannot be said to be included in the summary parameters. Hence, the cited references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Further, even if the summary parameters were included in the summary information, which they are not, the teachings of Jagadish nevertheless fail to teach the claim limitation since neither the summary parameters nor the summary information are “data maintained independently from the host site on a user computer terminal” as claim 1 recites. This is clear from looking at Fig. 1B of Jagadish. The summary information is stored in the SD (summary database, see col. 4, l. 11). The summary parameters are stored in the summary customer profile database. Neither of these are “maintained ... on a user computer terminal,” which is the online terminal, according to the office action.

Further still, if the summary parameters are the “data maintained independently from the host computer system” and the billing analysis system is the host computer system, then the summary parameters cannot be included in the summary information, since the summary information is maintained on the host computer system. In other words, the office action cannot have it both ways since either interpretation alone fails to teach all the claim limitations and the two interpretations cannot exist simultaneously.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Claim 8 includes a similar limitation and is believed to be allowable, at least for the same reasons. The remaining claims depend from either claim 1 or claim 8 and are believed to be allowable, at least for the reasons stated above.

Appl. No. 09/001,643  
Amdt. dated June 27, 2005  
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure  
Examining Group 2178

PATENT

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'IEB', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Irvin E. Branch  
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
IEB:arl  
60489996 v1